

REMARKS

Claims 2-27 are pending in the case. Claims 10-21, 23 and 25 are allowed; claims 2, 4-6, 22 and 24 are allowable if rewritten in independent form; and claims 1, 3, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Anderson et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,194,498; hereafter "*Anderson*"). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Anderson*. Claim 1 is herein cancelled and claims 2-9, 22 and 24 are herein amended. New claims 26 and 27 are herein added. No new matter has been introduced. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and the remarks below.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 3, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Anderson*.

Specifically, the Office Action states that the product described in Example A of *Anderson* would inherently be able to function as a pigment dispersing agent.

By the foregoing and, claim 2 is now the independent claim in this case and all of the claims are dependent on claim 2. Accordingly, this rejection is moot.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Anderson* as applied to claim 1.

Specifically, the Office Action states that *Anderson* teaches that potassium carbonates may be used as acid acceptors and, although *Anderson* fails to expressly teach sodium carbonate, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use sodium carbonate as an acid acceptor.

As discussed above, claim 1 has been cancelled and claim 8 is herein amended to depend from claim 2 that clearly distinguishes the present method from that of *Anderson*.

Accordingly, claim 8 is not obvious over *Anderson* and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) over *Anderson* should be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action states that claims 2, 4-6, 22 and 24 are allowable if rewritten in independent form.

As discussed above, claim 2 has been amended to become an independent claim by incorporating the limitations of claim 1. Claims 4-6, 22 and 24 are amended to become directly or indirectly dependent from claim 2.

Accordingly, Applicants believe claims 2, 4-6, 22 and 24 are now in condition for allowance.

Claims 4-6 are additionally amended to correct the internal discrepancies. These claims relate to aryl disulfonyl halide, aryl disulfonyl chloride and specific examples of disulfonyl chloride, respectively, rather than aryl monosulfonyl compounds. Accordingly, the amendments correct to reflect these subjects matter. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, at page 4, line 21 through page 5, line 1.

New claims 26 and 27 relate to aryl monosulfonyl halide and a specific example of monosulfonyl halide, respectively. Support for the new claims can be found, for example, at page 4, lines 21-23. No new matter has been introduced.

In view of the above-presented amendments and remarks, Applicants believe all the pending claims are now in condition for allowance, an early notification of which is earnestly requested.

Although this submission is being made by the undersigned, the correspondence address for the present application has not been changed from that on the records. An Associate Power of Attorney is attached hereto.

Dated: July 15, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Edward A. Meilman

Edward A. Meilman

Registration No.: 24,735

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-2714

(212) 835-1400

Attorney for Applicant

Attachment: Associate Power of Attorney